



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,964	08/15/2004	Yongyong Xu		4963
44642	7590	06/13/2007		
YONGYONG XU 630 SANTA CRUZ TERRACE SUNNYVALE, CA 94085			EXAMINER MORRISON, JAY A	
			ART UNIT 2168	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/710,964

Applicant(s)

XU, YONGYONG

Examiner

Jay A. Morrison

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 60-101 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 60-101 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. Claims 1-30 and 60-101 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1,60,73 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claim 1, the claim must end with a period.

As per claim 60, line 4: "comprising of:" should be "comprising:".

As per claim 60, lines 6-7: "one said plurality" should be "one of said plurality".

As per claim 60, the claim must end with a period and not a semicolon.

As per claim 73, lines 2: "virtual community" should be "a virtual community".

As per claim 73, line 12: "comprising of" should be "comprising".

As per claim 73, the claim must end with a period.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-30 and 60-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1,60 and 73 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term "over" in claims 1 and 60 is used by the claim to mean "hosting", while the accepted meaning is "above in place or position." The term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "each of said user" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "each of said plurality of users".

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said each user" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "each of said plurality of users".

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said community" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "said dynamic community".

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the resource" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the resource based virtual community" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the dynamic community".

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the community server" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the server".

Claim 60 recites the limitation "said virtual community area" in lines 20 and 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "said plurality of virtual community areas".

Claim 60 recites the limitation "said user" in lines 22-23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "each of said plurality of users".

Claim 60 recites the limitation "said resource" in line 23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 61 recites the limitation "the virtual community areas" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the plurality of virtual community areas".

Claim 62 recites the limitation "the global universal community server" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 63 recites the limitation "the global user database" in line 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the user access database".

Claim 73 recites the limitation "said each user" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "each of said plurality of users".

Claim 73 recites the limitation "said community" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "said dynamic community".

Claim 73 recites the limitation "said each of plurality of resources" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "each of said plurality of resources".

It is noted that the Application is replete with other similar antecedent basis problems and appropriate correction is requested as necessary.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-10,15-19,22,25-28,60-65,67-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearlman et al. ('Pearlman' hereinafter) ("A community authorization service for group collaboration" by Pearlman, L., Welch, V., Foster, I., Kesselman, C. and Tuecke, S.; Policies for Distributed Systems and Networks, 2002. Proceedings Third International Workshop on 5-7 June 2002; Page(s): 50 - 59) in view of Sutherland et al. ('Sutherland' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2002/0120757).

As per claim 1, Pearlman teaches

A virtual community system over a plurality of users and a plurality of resources accessible by said plurality of users comprising of: (see abstract)

and said server operable to associate each of said plurality of resources accessed by each of said user to said each user; (individuals using resources, section I)

and said server operable to form a dynamic community for each of said plurality of resources; (collaboratories, section I, second paragraph)

said community comprising each of said plurality of users who is accessing the same said each of plurality of resources. (collaboratories, section I, second paragraph)

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "a server operable to monitor each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources".

However, Sutherland discloses "a server operable to monitor each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources" (user associated with content, paragraph [0013]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Sutherland because using the steps of "a server operable to monitor each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing content to be shared. This gives the user the advantage of being able to collaborate with other users.

As per claim 2, Pearlman teaches

each of the plurality of resources is associated with a corresponding community.
(sharing rules, section 1)

As per claim 3, Pearlman teaches
each of the plurality of resources comprises a web resource. (section 5)

As per claim 4, Pearlman teaches
each of the plurality of resources comprises a non-web resource. (section 5)

As per claim 5, Pearlman teaches
each of the plurality of resources comprises a unique name. (which service,
section 3)

As per claim 6, Pearlman teaches
users automatically become members of the resource based virtual community
associated with the accessed resource when they access the resource unless the users
are required to login to the community server. (authorization, section 3)

As per claim 7, Pearlman teaches
the community server is further operable to provide community services to
community members. (section 3.1)

Art Unit: 2168

As per claim 8, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to enable communication between community members. (collaboration, section 1)

As per claim 9, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to enable community members to perform community activities. (collaboration, section 1)

As per claim 10, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to provide collaboration between community members. (collaboration, section 1)

As per claim 15, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to enable new community services from community members. (individual representing community, section 3.1)

As per claim 16, Pearlman teaches

the resources comprise private resources having a unique name. (which service, section 3)

As per claim 17, Pearlman teaches

the community servers is further operable to provide community member authentication services. (authorization, section 3)

As per claim 18, Pearlman teaches

the community server is provided by the resource server by setting up and serves the virtual community along with the resource. (section 1)

As per claim 19, Pearlman teaches

each of the plurality of web resource servers is operable to contact other community servers to provide community services. (section 3)

As per claim 22, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to uniquely identify each community member across multiple communities. (section 3)

As per claim 25, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to keep statistical information regarding the community. (provide 30% of its resources, section 3)

As per claim 26, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to connect users who have accessed the same resource and users who are accessing the same resource. (section 3)

As per claim 27, Pearlman teaches

a proxy server coupled to the community server and a web resource server, the proxy server operable to serve a web resource content and connect to the community based on the resource being served. (security, section 2)

As per claim 28, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to combine a plurality of communities into a larger community based upon similar topical resources. (section 3)

As per claim 60, Pearlman teaches

A universal virtual communities system over a plurality of users and a plurality of resources accessible by said plurality of users comprising of: (see abstract)

a user access database that containing resource accessing record from each of said plurality of users to each of said plurality of resources a universal virtual community server operable to monitor every access from each of said plurality of users to each of said plurality of resources and then performs additional functions of: (server entry for user contains action, section 3, third paragraph)

storing said access to said user access database; (server entries, section 3, third paragraph)

updating said virtual community area with said access from said user to said resource. (server entry for user contains action, section 3, third paragraph)

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “a plurality of virtual community areas, where each of said plurality of resources is mapped to one said plurality of virtual community areas by a uniform resource locator (URL) and each of said plurality of virtual community areas contains community and user accessing information for said mapped resource” nor “mapping said accessed resource to said virtual community area by said uniform resource locator (URL)”

However, Sutherland discloses “a plurality of virtual community areas, where each of said plurality of resources is mapped to one said plurality of virtual community areas by a uniform resource locator (URL) and each of said plurality of virtual community areas contains community and user accessing information for said mapped resource” (URL invitation to user for group albums, paragraphs [0031]) and “mapping said accessed resource to said virtual community area by said uniform resource locator (URL)” (URL invitation to group, paragraph [0030]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Sutherland because using the steps of “a plurality of virtual community areas, where each of said plurality of resources is mapped to one said plurality of virtual community areas by a uniform resource locator (URL) and each of said plurality of virtual community areas contains community and user accessing information for said mapped resource” and “mapping said accessed resource to said virtual community area by said uniform resource locator (URL)” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by improving access to

information within the community. This gives the user the advantage of having a common browser interface whereby all users can access the pages.

As per claim 61, Pearlman teaches

the virtual community areas are stored in directories, files, or databases. (Unix account, section 2.4)

As per claim 62, Pearlman teaches

the global universal virtual community server comprises a group of servers. (CAS server contains entries for servers, section 3)

As per claim 63, Pearlman teaches

the global user database comprises a distributed database. (distributed, section 3.1)

As per claim 64, Pearlman teaches

each virtual community area is created on demand when a first user accesses a resource. (section 9.1)

As per claim 65, Pearlman teaches

the global user database creates a new user record only when a new user entry is queried and is not in the database. (section 3.1)

As per claim 67, Pearlman teaches
each virtual community area comprises information regarding the community.
(section 1)

As per claim 68, Pearlman teaches
each virtual community area comprises server side components that support
user and community interactivity and activities. (section 6)

As per claim 69, Pearlman teaches
each virtual community area may utilize server side technologies including server
side script, CGI, Servlet, web services and weblogs. (logs, section 9.1; 'may' denotes an
optionally recited limitation and optionally recited limitations are not guaranteed to take
place and are therefore not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C))

As per claim 70, Pearlman teaches
the global user database comprises the current status of individual user's
information. (section 1)

As per claim 71, Pearlman teaches
the global user database stores users' personal data including messages from
other users, preferences or privacy and security settings. (section 3)

As per claim 72, Pearlman teaches

the universal community server is operable to group different community areas together to form a larger community for a bigger scope of resources. (section 3)

As per claim 73, Pearlman teaches

A method of forming virtual community in a system with a plurality of users and a plurality of resources, the method comprising the steps of: (see abstract)

each of said plurality of users accesses said plurality of resources;
(collaboratories, section I, second paragraph)

said server associates each of said plurality of resources accessed by each of said plurality of users to said each user; (collaboratories, section I, second paragraph)

and said server forms a dynamic community for each of said plurality of resources, said community comprising of each of said plurality of users who is accessing the same said each of plurality of resources. (communities with resources, section 1)

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "a server monitors each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources".

However, Sutherland discloses "a server monitors each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources" (user associated with content, paragraph [0013]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Sutherland because using the steps of "a

Art Unit: 2168

server monitors each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing content to be shared. This gives the user the advantage of being able to collaborate with other users.

As per claim 74, Pearlman teaches

the resource being accessed by the user is a web resource, including a web site, a web page, a newsgroup, or a discussion forum. (section 6)

As per claim 75, Pearlman teaches

the resource being accessed by the user is a non-web resource, including a software product, a bulletin board, a game, an FTP site, a file, an image, a photo, or products that can be shared by users. (FTP, section 6)

As per claim 76, Pearlman teaches

each of the plurality of accessed resources is associated with a corresponding resource based virtual community. (sharing rules, section 1)

As per claim 77, Pearlman teaches

enabling new community services from community members. (resource providers, section 1)

Art Unit: 2168

As per claim 78, Pearlman teaches
providing users community information and community services; including hit count, total users, current users, feedback, comments, ratings, reviews, references or other useful information for the resource. (accounting, section 9.1)

As per claim 79, Pearlman teaches
enabling users collaboration with other community members; including making comments, publishing reviews, rating resources, writing notes, sending messages, sharing whiteboards, chatting, helping each other, asking and answering questions, exchanging ideas, interests matching scheduling meetings, online auctions, online dating, broadcasting or other campaigns such as marketing or advertisements.
(collaboration, section 1)

As per claim 80,
each of the plurality of users accessing the resources and resource based communities comprises the steps of: (see abstract)
each of a plurality of users accessing the resources; (section 1)
the accessed resource returning the original resource; (section 1)
and the accessed resource connecting users to the virtual community based on the accessed resource. (section 3)

As per claim 81,

each of the plurality of users accessing the resources comprises the steps of :

(section 1)

each of a plurality of users accessing the resources through a proxy server;

(section 2.2)

the proxy server returning the original resource; (section 2.2)

and the proxy server connecting the user to the virtual community based on the accessed resource. (section 2.2)

7. Claims 11-14,20-21,24,29-30,66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearlman et al. ('Pearlman' hereinafter) ("A community authorization service for group collaboration" by Pearlman, L., Welch, V., Foster, I., Kesselman, C. and Tuecke, S.; Policies for Distributed Systems and Networks, 2002. Proceedings Third International Workshop on 5-7 June 2002; Page(s): 50 - 59) in view of Sutherland et al. ('Sutherland' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2002/0120757) and further in view of Matthews et al. ('Matthews' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2003/0050986 A1).

As per claim 11,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the community server is further operable to provide notification to community members when a new user joins the community."

Art Unit: 2168

However, Matthews discloses "the community server is further operable to provide notification to community members when a new user joins the community" (paragraph [0057]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Matthews because using the steps of "the community server is further operable to provide notification to community members when a new user joins the community" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by enhancing interaction between community members. This gives the user the advantage of having a channel for communication between members available.

As per claim 12,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the community server is further operable to enable community members to communicate with users outside the community."

However, Matthews discloses "the community server is further operable to enable community members to communicate with users outside the community" (email, paragraph [0057]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Matthews because using the steps of "the community server is further operable to enable community members to communicate with users outside the community" would have given those skilled in the

art the tools to improve the invention by enhancing interaction between community members. This gives the user the advantage of having a channel for communication between members available.

As per claim 13,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the community server is further operable to provide community members with information regarding the community."

However, Matthews discloses "the community server is further operable to provide community members with information regarding the community" (paragraph [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Matthews because using the steps of "the community server is further operable to provide community members with information regarding the community" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by enhancing interaction between members of the community. This gives the user the advantage of being able to communicate effectively with community members.

As per claim 14, Pearlman teaches

"the information comprises information presented to the community members while they are accessing the resource. (section 6)

As per claim 20,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the community server is disposed behind a firewall to limit community members to users in an intranet."

However, Matthews discloses "the community server is disposed behind a firewall to limit community members to users in an intranet" (paragraph [0028]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Matthews because using the steps of "the community server is disposed behind a firewall to limit community members to users in an intranet" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by providing security for members of the community. This gives the user the advantage of having their data and community safe from security risks.

As per claim 21,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the community server is further operable to provide user privacy preferences to community members."

However, Matthews discloses "the community server is further operable to provide user privacy preferences to community members" (block, paragraph [0064]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Matthews because using the steps of "the community server is further operable to provide user privacy preferences to community members" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve

the invention by providing security for members of the community. This gives the user the advantage of having their data and community safe from security risks.

As per claim 24,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the community server is further operable to organize an information content of each virtual community into a plurality of hyperlinked pages."

However, Matthews discloses "the community server is further operable to organize an information content of each virtual community into a plurality of hyperlinked pages" (paragraph [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Matthews because using the steps of "the community server is further operable to organize an information content of each virtual community into a plurality of hyperlinked pages" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by improving access to information within the community. This gives the user the advantage of having a common browser interface whereby all users can access the pages.

As per claim 29

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the community server is further operable to enable searches of each of the plurality of communities."

However, Matthews discloses "the community server is further operable to enable searches of each of the plurality of communities" (paragraph [0025]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Matthews because using the steps of "the community server is further operable to enable searches of each of the plurality of communities" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by improving access to information within the community. This gives the user the advantage of having a common browser interface whereby all users can access the pages.

As per claim 30,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the community server is further operable to provide customized filtering preferences set by users, systems, and communities."

However, Matthews discloses "the community server is further operable to provide customized filtering preferences set by users, systems, and communities" (paragraph [0025]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Matthews because using the steps of "the community server is further operable to provide customized filtering preferences set by users, systems, and communities" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by improving access to information within the

community. This gives the user the advantage of having a common browser interface whereby all users can access the pages.

As per claim 66,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "each virtual community area comprises a web server or web pages."

However, Matthews discloses "each virtual community area comprises a web server or web pages" (paragraph [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Matthews because using the steps of "each virtual community area comprises a web server or web pages" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by improving access to information within the community. This gives the user the advantage of having a common browser interface whereby all users can access the pages.

8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearlman et al. ('Pearlman' hereinafter) ("A community authorization service for group collaboration" by Pearlman, L., Welch, V., Foster, I., Kesselman, C. and Tuecke, S.; Policies for Distributed Systems and Networks, 2002. Proceedings Third International Workshop on 5-7 June 2002; Page(s): 50 - 59) in view of Sutherland et al. ('Sutherland'

hereinafter) (Publication Number 2002/0120757) and further in view of Katzman et al. ('Katzman' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2002/0046051 A1).

As per claim 23,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the community server is further operable to track community member's activities with the community member's permission."

However, Katzman discloses "the community server is further operable to track community member's activities with the community member's permission" (paragraph [0082]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Katzman because using the steps of "the community server is further operable to track community member's activities with the community member's permission" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by trends to be tracked for future on-line business use. This gives the user the advantage of being able to have the choice of being tracked for future opportunities or other use.

9. Claims 82-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearlman et al. ('Pearlman' hereinafter) ("A community authorization service for group collaboration" by Pearlman, L., Welch, V., Foster, I., Kesselman, C. and Tuecke, S.;

Policies for Distributed Systems and Networks, 2002. Proceedings Third International Workshop on 5-7 June 2002; Page(s): 50 - 59) in view of Sutherland et al. ('Sutherland' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2002/0120757) and further in view of Dinan et al. ('Dinan' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2002/0097267 A1).

As per claim 82, Pearlman teaches
each of the plurality of users connecting to the resource based virtual community associated with the accessed resource comprises the steps of: (see abstract)

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "a client side software installed to user's computer discovering the resource accessed by the user; and the client side software connecting the user to the virtual community based on the accessed resource."

However, Dinan discloses "a client side software installed to user's computer discovering the resource accessed by the user; and the client side software connecting the user to the virtual community based on the accessed resource" (paragraph [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "a client side software installed to user's computer discovering the resource accessed by the user; and the client side software connecting the user to the virtual community based on the accessed resource" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the

community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 83,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate “the user accessing the virtual community along with the accessed resource in a non-distributive way including using context menus, status bars, popup windows, balloon help messages, task bars to embedded frames inside a current web page.”

However, Dinan discloses “the user accessing the virtual community along with the accessed resource in a non- distributive way including using context menus, status bars, popup windows, balloon help messages, task bars to embedded frames inside a current web page” (paragraph [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of “the user accessing the virtual community along with the accessed resource in a non- distributive way including using context menus, status bars, popup windows, balloon help messages, task bars to embedded frames inside a current web page” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 84,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "each of the plurality of resources comprises a non-Internet based product including a software, a product, a device, an audio, a video, a service or other commodities."

However, Dinan discloses "each of the plurality of resources comprises a non-Internet based product including a software, a product, a device, an audio, a video, a service or other commodities" (paragraph [0048]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "each of the plurality of resources comprises a non-Internet based product including a software, a product, a device, an audio, a video, a service or other commodities" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 85,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the user connects to the resource based virtual communities through a mobile device including a PDA and a cellular phone."

However, Dinan discloses “the user connects to the resource based virtual communities through a mobile device including a PDA and a cellular phone” (paragraph [0039]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of “the user connects to the resource based virtual communities through a mobile device including a PDA and a cellular phone” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 86,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate “a client side software installable to a user’s computer, the software operable to detect users activity of accessing a resource and connecting to the virtual community based on the accessed resource.”

However, Dinan discloses “a client side software installable to a user’s computer, the software operable to detect users activity of accessing a resource and connecting to the virtual community based on the accessed resource” (paragraph [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of “a client side software installable to a user’s computer, the software operable to

Art Unit: 2168

detect users activity of accessing a resource and connecting to the virtual community based on the accessed resource" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 87,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the client side software also provides a toolbar button installable on user's browser operable to connect to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software also provides a toolbar button installable on user's browser operable to connect to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user" (paragraph [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software also provides a toolbar button installable on user's browser operable to connect to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 88,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the client side software also provides a context menu installable on the user's browser operable for connecting to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software also provides a context menu installable on the user's browser operable for connecting to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user" (paragraph [0039]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software also provides a context menu installable on the user's browser operable for connecting to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 89,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the client side software is installed manually by the user or automatically when the user accesses the resource."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is installed manually by the user or automatically when the user accesses the resource" (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software is installed manually by the user or automatically when the user accesses the resource" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 90,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the client side software is operable to display a virtual community page displayed in a separate frame, popup window or balloon window along with the main resource."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is operable to display a virtual community page displayed in a separate frame, popup window or balloon window along with the main resource" (paragraph [0046]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software is operable to display a virtual community page displayed in a separate frame, popup window or balloon window along with the main resource" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in

the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 91,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the client side software is a standalone software agent."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is a standalone software agent" (paragraph [0062]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software is a standalone software agent" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 92,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the client side software is operable to discover current web resources accessed by the user by monitoring web requests from browsers."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is operable to discover current web resources accessed by the user by monitoring web requests from browsers" (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software is operable to discover current web resources accessed by the user by monitoring web requests from browsers" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 93,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the client side software is operable to detect the current resource being used by hooking into the protocol handling chain, or using a protocol filter, a kernel driver, or a customized content handler; or by listening to the system or windows event from browsers, or hooking into process, system and network APIs."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is operable to detect the current resource being used by hooking into the protocol handling chain, or using a protocol filter, a kernel driver, or a customized content handler; or by listening to the system or windows event from browsers, or hooking into process, system and network APIs" (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software is operable to detect the current resource being used

by hooking into the protocol handling chain, or using a protocol filter, a kernel driver, or a customized content handler; or by listening to the system or windows event from browsers, or hooking into process, system and network APIs” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 94,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate “the client side software is a browser.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software is a browser” (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software is a browser” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 95,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate “the client side software is operable to make multiple connections to multiple virtual communities based on multiple

Art Unit: 2168

resources the user is accessing and thus enabling users to participate in multiple communities simultaneously.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software is operable to make multiple connections to multiple virtual communities based on multiple resources the user is accessing and thus enabling users to participate in multiple communities simultaneously” (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software is operable to make multiple connections to multiple virtual communities based on multiple resources the user is accessing and thus enabling users to participate in multiple communities simultaneously” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 96,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate “the client side software is a browser plugin integrated in a user's existing web browser.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software is a browser plugin integrated in a user's existing web browser” (paragraph [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the

Art Unit: 2168

steps of "the client side software is a browser plugin integrated in a user's existing web browser" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 97,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the browser plugin includes browser helper objects, plugins, applets, Javascript, flash, ActiveX object, content, dynamic html, connection or protocol filters and any other type of software extension." (paragraph [0008])

However, Dinan discloses "the browser plugin includes browser helper objects, plugins, applets, Javascript, flash, ActiveX object, content, dynamic html, connection or protocol filters and any other type of software extension" (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the browser plugin includes browser helper objects, plugins, applets, Javascript, flash, ActiveX object, content, dynamic html, connection or protocol filters and any other type of software extension" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 98

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the client side software can be a special component, shared object, dynamic library, driver or other extensions."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software can be a special component, shared object, dynamic library, driver or other extensions" (paragraph [0046]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software can be a special component, shared object, dynamic library, driver or other extensions" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 99,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the client side software is operable to detect the current software used by the user and then connect to the associated virtual community based on that resource."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is operable to detect the current software used by the user and then connect to the associated virtual community based on that resource" (paragraph [0046]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software is operable to detect the current software used by the user and then connect to the associated virtual community based on that resource" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 100,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate "the client side software is statically or dynamically linked to a software resource and operable to run along with the software resource when the software resource is started by the user."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is statically or dynamically linked to a software resource and operable to run along with the software resource when the software resource is started by the user" (paragraph [0050]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software is statically or dynamically linked to a software resource and operable to run along with the software resource when the software resource is started by the user" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community

Art Unit: 2168

due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 101,

Neither Pearlman nor Sutherland explicitly indicate “the client side software resides the software resource to provide new functions, features, services and applications.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software resides the software resource to provide new functions, features, services and applications” (paragraph [0046]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman, Sutherland and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software resides the software resource to provide new functions, features, services and applications” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 and 60-101 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2168

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100